


IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AMARILLO DIVISION



MICHAEL JAMES VIDETICH,

Petitioner,

v.

DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID,

Respondent.

2:21-CV-267-Z-BR

ORDER

On January 24, 2022, the United States Magistrate Judge entered a Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation (“FCR”) to Deny Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus filed by Michael James Videtich (“Petitioner”) (ECF No. 5). No objections to the FCR have been filed. After making an independent review of the pleadings, files, and records in this case, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge’s FCR and **DENIES** the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 3).

Considering the record and pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22(b), Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts, and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c), the Court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability because Petitioner has failed to make “a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *see also Hernandez v. Thaler*, 630 F.3d 420, 424 (5th Cir. 2011).

The Court **ADOPTS** and **INCORPORATES** by reference the Magistrate Judge’s FCR filed in this case in support of its finding that Petitioner has failed to show: (1) that reasonable jurists would find this Court’s “assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong”; or (2) that reasonable jurists would find “it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right” and “debatable whether [this Court] was correct in its procedural ruling.” *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484.

SO ORDERED.

February 28, 2022



MATTHEW J. KACSMARYK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE